

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

In the June 15, 2005, Office Action in this application, claims 25-40 were allowed and claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; claims 1-4, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Davis '540 patent. Claim 3 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

The allowance of claims 25-40 is acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 have been cancelled.

Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim 16 and is believed to now be in condition for allowance.

Claim 3 has been amended as indicated above to address the Section 112 rejection. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 3, and its dependent claim 4, patentably distinguish over the Davis reference.

Claim 3 has been amended to clarify that the recited apparatus includes at least two differencing circuits, each one of the individual differencing circuits being associated with a corresponding single channel signal on a one-to-one basis. Thus, the recited apparatus generates at least two difference values. As further recited in claim 3, the apparatus includes a difference value combining circuit that receives the multiple difference values, one such value being associated with each of the two or more signal channels that has an individual differencing circuit associated with it. The difference value combining circuit combines the multiple difference values to generate an overall difference value that corresponds to a program signal portion of the multi-channel program signal. A removal circuit then deletes a multi-window segment from the multi-channel program signal, the deleted segment beginning with the initial channel signal window defined by the overall difference value and ending with a subsequent channel signal window defined by the overall difference value. Upon, review of the Davis reference, it is submitted that none of these features of the claim 3 apparatus are either taught or suggested by Davis.

For the reason set forth above, Applicant is of the good faith belief that all claims now pending in this application are in compliance with the requirements of Section 112 and patentably distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant requests that the application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: November 10, 2005

By: Michael J. Pollock
Michael J. Pollock
Reg. No. 29,098
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Attorney Docket No. PII-1100